LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Do Nations 'Give Up' Sovereignty?

To the Editor:

With reference to Earl Osborn's letter (April issue) about the problem of national sovereignty, I have felt for a long time that there is more misunderstanding on this subject than any other in the international field.

At the heart of the issue is not the "giving up" of sovereignty but the use of sovereignty by nations to acquire something that their people need.

When Italy adheres to the postal convention, it does not give up sovereignty. Italy merely uses its sovereignty to obtain for its people the right to send letters into other nations around the world. When Canada adheres to the International Civil Aviation conventions, it does not give up its sovereignty, it uses sovereignty to acquire air service for the Canadian people. Look at every treaty and consider the reasons for the different nations' participation; you'll find in each case that some benefit was derived for that nation's people.

Italy can withdraw from the postal convention and Canada from the International Civil Aviation conventions at any time and their sovereignty won't be lessened.

It is erroneous and devastating to talk in terms of giving up, or abdicating sovereignty. Ultimate sovereignty in the United States belongs to the people. They have used that sovereignty to acquire a democratic government, and constitutional and legal rights.

Chief Justice Warren ordered a survey on the acceptance of U.N. treaties by the various nations. Presented at the World Peace Through Law Conference in Geneva last year, the study showed that nations accept only those treaties that provide something their people want. It also demonstrated how nations go about exercising their sovereignty. Some nations have accepted as few as four treaties while the United States has accepted more than four thousand. Americans, it seems, are more active in the world and want many more treaty protections and benefits. Any idea that the acceptance of these treaties has weakened the sovereignty of the United States is absurd. Our nation is the greatest trader, and our people are the greatest travelers on earth. We could withdraw from all of our treaty commitments tomorrow, but that would only undermine world trade and understanding. A nation's sovereignty always remains within the nation, or in its people; they never give it up. They merely use it, or extend it, to achieve useful things for their people.

CHARLES S. RHYNE.
Washington, D.C.

HOPE IN RESEARCH

To the Editor:

I have just completed reading the February, March and April issues of *War/Peace Report*, and I must say that the effect of engaging in this process can only be described as an intellectual thunderbolt. Your constant adherence to the basic principle of peace without any rancor or venom constitutes a unique achievement in the field.

Amidst a galaxy of outstanding brilliance to note the significance of any one contribution may seem invidious, but I must cite Michael Studdert-Kennedy's review of *The Dissenting Academy*, edited by Theodore Roszak, which bears on a subject occupying my thoughts for the past 20 years. Roszak's collection of essays discloses the shocking extent to which the social sciences have been either prostituted in the development of techniques of destruction, or emasculated by research on the trivial.

I myself have come to regard the implementation of research in the social sciences as the dominant hope for the world, the exclusive element on which reliance could be placed to extricate ourselves from the political difficulties presently afflicting the world. I still have hopes for meaningful, constructive research, and, as a start in this direction, I refer to the seven-volume work by Dr. Filmer S. C. Northrop, until his retirement holder of the Sterling Chair of Philosophy and Law at Yale Law School.

In brief, by philosophically interpreting previous research in physiological psychology, cybernetics, sociological jurisprudence, cultural anthropology and other areas of study, Dr. Northrop presents a convincing theory that Universal Man possesses capabilities and attributes identical in quality to those possessed by individuals who rate as civilized, cultured and intelligent. Thus, the door is open to studies that will lay the foundation for a World Order evoking the loyalty and support of all people on this earth.

WILLIAM B. GLOVER
Keene Valley, N. Y.

Is your address and zip code, as shown at the left, correct? If there is any error, please let us know right away.

War/Peace Report
218 E. 18th St.
New York, N.Y. 10003

Addressee:

WP-30993
UNIV MICROFILMS
LIBRARY SERVICES
XEROX CORP
ANN ARBOR MI 48106

WPR INDEX
January-June/July, 1968

The following articles appeared in *War/Peace Report* from January to June/July, 1968. (Indexes appear in June and December each year. Back copies are available, 50 cents each.)

JANUARY—The Great ABM Pork Barrel, by Seymour M. Hersh; Needed: An Interlocutor to Talk With the N.L.F., editorial; A Peace Movement in Search of a Party (Vietnam and the '68 Elections), by Kenneth E. Boulding; SANE'S Wayward Drift to the Left, by Donald Keys.

FEBRUARY—Deterrence: For How Long?, by Dr. Jerome D. Frank; Financing Expanded U.N. Aid, by Byron L. Johnson; Another Step in the Disarmament Walk (U.S.-Soviet draft for a non-proliferation treaty), an editorial; Do We Really Need an Enemy?, review by Elizabeth Jay Hollins of *Report From Iron Mountain.*

MARCH—The Grand Strategy of Hanoi and the N.L.F., by Tran Van Ky; As Newsmen See the War, a panel discussion with correspondents Robert Shaplen, William Tuohy, Peter Arnett and R. W. Apple, Jr., moderated by Al Perlmutter; Vietnam and the Quest for World Law and Order, an editorial; The Triumph of Media Over Matter (Vietnam and the '68 Elections), by Sen. George D. Aiken.

APRIL—The N.P.T.: Nuclear Watershed, by Richard Hudson; The National Liberation Front: Why Do South Vietnamese Join?, by Don Luce; The War and American Honor, guest editorial by O. Edmund Clubb; Education and Ideology, a discussion with Harold Taylor, Pal Ipper and his son, Peter; Academia and the 'National Interest,' a review essay by Michael Studdert-Kennedy of *The Dissenting Academy.*

MAY—Will China Hold Together?, by Harald Munthe-Kaas; China: Retrospect and Prospect, by Sen. Mike Mansfield; For a World Political Party, an editorial; People and G.N.P. in 2000 A.D., a review essay by Congressman George E. Brown, Jr., of *The Year 2000*; As the South Sees the World, a review essay by Alfred O. Hero of *The World and Ridgeway, South Carolina.*

JUNE/JULY—Behind the Ferment in East Europe, a discussion among five U.N. correspondents; How the "Other Side" Sees it Now, by Tran Van Ky; N.G.O.'s at the U.N.: A New Role?, by Virginia Saurwein; Entering a New Phase on Disarmament, an editorial; Coalescing on the Left, a review essay by Gus Tyler of *Toward a Democratic Left.*

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Do Nations 'Give Up' Sovereignty?

To the Editor:

With reference to Earl Osborn's letter (April issue) about the problem of national sovereignty, I have felt for a long time that there is more misunderstanding on this subject than any other in the international field.

At the heart of the issue is not the "giving up" of sovereignty but the use of sovereignty by nations to acquire something that their people need.

When Italy adheres to the postal convention, it does not give up sovereignty. Italy merely uses its sovereignty to obtain for its people the right to send letters into other nations around the world. When Canada adheres to the International Civil Aviation conventions, it does not give up its sovereignty, it uses sovereignty to acquire air service for the Canadian people. Look at every treaty and consider the reasons for the different nations' participation; you'll find in each case that some benefit was derived for that nation's people.

Italy can withdraw from the postal convention and Canada from the International Civil Aviation conventions at any time and their sovereignty won't be lessened.

It is erroneous and devastating to talk in terms of giving up, or abdicating sovereignty. Ultimate sovereignty in the United States belongs to the people. They have used that sovereignty to acquire a democratic government, and constitutional and legal rights.

Chief Justice Warren ordered a survey on the acceptance of U.N. treaties by the various nations. Presented at the World Peace Through Law Conference in Geneva last year, the study showed that nations accept only those treaties that provide something their people want. It also demonstrated how nations go about exercising their sovereignty. Some nations have accepted as few as four treaties while the United States has accepted more than four thousand. Americans, it seems, are more active in the world and want many more treaty protections and benefits. Any idea that the acceptance of these treaties has weakened the sovereignty of the United States is absurd. Our nation is the greatest trader, and our people are the greatest travelers on earth. We could withdraw from all of our treaty commitments tomorrow, but that would only undermine world trade and understanding. A nation's sovereignty always remains within the nation, or in its people; they never give it up. They merely use it, or extend it, to achieve useful things for their people.

CHARLES S. RHYNE.
Washington, D.C.

HOPE IN RESEARCH

To the Editor:

I have just completed reading the February, March and April issues of *War/Peace Report*, and I must say that the effect of engaging in this process can only be described as an intellectual thunderbolt. Your constant adherence to the basic principle of peace without any rancor or venom constitutes a unique achievement in the field.

Amidst a galaxy of outstanding brilliance to note the significance of any one contribution may seem invidious, but I must cite Michael Studdert-Kennedy's review of *The Dissenting Academy*, edited by Theodore Roszak, which bears on a subject occupying my thoughts for the past 20 years. Roszak's collection of essays discloses the shocking extent to which the social sciences have been either prostituted in the development of techniques of destruction, or emasculated by research on the trivial.

I myself have come to regard the implementation of research in the social sciences as the dominant hope for the world, the exclusive element on which reliance could be placed to extricate ourselves from the political difficulties presently afflicting the world. I still have hopes for meaningful, constructive research, and, as a start in this direction, I refer to the seven-volume work by Dr. Filmer S. C. Northrop, until his retirement holder of the Sterling Chair of Philosophy and Law at Yale Law School.

In brief, by philosophically interpreting previous research in physiological psychology, cybernetics, sociological jurisprudence, cultural anthropology and other areas of study, Dr. Northrop presents a convincing theory that Universal Man possesses capabilities and attributes identical in quality to those possessed by individuals who rate as civilized, cultured and intelligent. Thus, the door is open to studies that will lay the foundation for a World Order evoking the loyalty and support of all people on this earth.

WILLIAM B. GLOVER
Keene Valley, N. Y.

Is your address and zip code, as shown at the left, correct? If there is any error, please let us know right away.

War/Peace Report
218 E. 18th St.
New York, N.Y. 10003

Addressee:

WP-30993
UNIV MICROFILMS
LIBRARY SERVICES
XEROX CORP
ANN ARBOR MI 48106

WPR INDEX
January-June/July, 1968

The following articles appeared in *War/Peace Report* from January to June/July, 1968. (Indexes appear in June and December each year. Back copies are available, 50 cents each.)

JANUARY—The Great ABM Pork Barrel, by Seymour M. Hersh; Needed: An Interlocutor to Talk With the N.L.F., editorial; A Peace Movement in Search of a Party (Vietnam and the '68 Elections), by Kenneth E. Boulding; SANE'S Wayward Drift to the Left, by Donald Keys.

FEBRUARY—Deterrence: For How Long?, by Dr. Jerome D. Frank; Financing Expanded U.N. Aid, by Byron L. Johnson; Another Step in the Disarmament Walk (U.S.-Soviet draft for a non-proliferation treaty), an editorial; Do We Really Need an Enemy?, review by Elizabeth Jay Hollins of *Report From Iron Mountain.*

MARCH—The Grand Strategy of Hanoi and the N.L.F., by Tran Van Ky; As Newsmen See the War, a panel discussion with correspondents Robert Shaplen, William Tuohy, Peter Arnett and R. W. Apple, Jr., moderated by Al Perlmutter; Vietnam and the Quest for World Law and Order, an editorial; The Triumph of Media Over Matter (Vietnam and the '68 Elections), by Sen. George D. Aiken.

APRIL—The N.P.T.: Nuclear Watershed, by Richard Hudson; The National Liberation Front: Why Do South Vietnamese Join?, by Don Luce; The War and American Honor, guest editorial by O. Edmund Clubb; Education and Ideology, a discussion with Harold Taylor, Pal Ipper and his son, Peter; Academia and the 'National Interest,' a review essay by Michael Studdert-Kennedy of *The Dissenting Academy.*

MAY—Will China Hold Together?, by Harald Munthe-Kaas; China: Retrospect and Prospect, by Sen. Mike Mansfield; For a World Political Party, an editorial; People and G.N.P. in 2000 A.D., a review essay by Congressman George E. Brown, Jr., of *The Year 2000*; As the South Sees the World, a review essay by Alfred O. Hero of *The World and Ridgeway, South Carolina.*

JUNE/JULY—Behind the Ferment in East Europe, a discussion among five U.N. correspondents; How the "Other Side" Sees it Now, by Tran Van Ky; N.G.O.'s at the U.N.: A New Role?, by Virginia Saurwein; Entering a New Phase on Disarmament, an editorial; Coalescing on the Left, a review essay by Gus Tyler of *Toward a Democratic Left.*

Democrats, and so forth, win power today. As a matter of fact, we already have a world political party, if you look at the various world federalist organizations around the Western world and parts of Asia. They have tens of thousands of members, quite a few of them practicing politicians, who often introduce the issue of world government into their campaigns. There is a Parliamentary Group for World Government in the U.K., for example, consisting of perhaps a hundred M.P.'s of both major parties, which has been quite active, especially in education, for many years. Former United World Federalists head Alan Cranston has just won a seat in the U.S. Senate in California against arch-conservative Max Rafferty, and world federalism was an issue in that campaign. Since nearly all the federalist groups at the national level are affiliated with the World Association of World Federalists at the international level, this means that we already have the nucleus, at least, for a world political party.

W. WARREN WAGAR
Associate Professor of History
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, N. M.

EDITOR'S NOTE: *It does seem improbable that the nation states will voluntarily turn over their sovereignty, or areas of it, to an international authority even though logic indicates that this is the way to keep international peace. This is precisely why I think an outside force—a World Political Party, or Movement, of individuals—is needed to push on the nation states and international organizations. I doubt that W.A.W.F. could serve this function because its ideology—world federal government now—is too narrow and too Western to become a real political World Movement seeking to influence international relations and organizations on almost a day-by-day basis and finally to achieve some power on the world level. I would think it essential that the common denominator of the World Movement be low enough to permit individuals from Western, Communist and nonaligned countries to take part. My guess is that this common denominator would be by no means so low as to make the effort useless. I would expect that such a Movement could take far more specific and advanced positions on such questions as arms control and disarmament, economic development, and even crisis areas such as Vietnam and Czechoslovakia than can bodies controlled directly by governments, such as the U.N. Even if in the end this Movement can only "educate people and provide martyrs and arouse public interest," as you suggest, I still think it is worth trying.*—R.H.

Addressee:

AP-30993
UNIV MICROFILMS
LIBRARY SERVICES
XEROX CORP
ANN ARBOR MI 48106

WPR INDEX: August-December, 1968

The following articles appeared in *War/Peace Report* from August/September to December 1968. (Indexes appear in June and December each year. Back copies are available, 50 cents each.)

AUGUST/SEPTEMBER—The Sea Bed: Common Heritage of Mankind, by Arvid Pardo and Victor J. Gauci; The Politics of the Ocean Bottom, by Pat Reilly; An Arms Race on the Sea Bed?, by Seymour M. Hersh; We Must Contact Our Opponents, an interview with Dr. Phan Quang Dan; An Election Committee?, Nomination for "Boob of the Year," Bravo, Academician Sakharov!, editorials; Can the U.S. Win the Vietnam War?, three leading U.S. correspondents in South Vietnam answer questions put to them by the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

OCTOBER—Emerging New Power: The World Corporation, by Arthur Barber; Making World Corporations into World Citizens, by George W. Ball; Space Communications: A New Instrument for World Order, by Richard N. Gardner; What Big Powers Do to Little Powers, The World Corporation, Political Potluck, '68 Style, editorials; How Best to Limit Arms?, review essay by I. S. Glagolev; Talking With Peace Activists, review essay by Arthur Springer; Uppsala: The Churches and Peace, by Homer A. Jack.

NOVEMBER—A Vietnam Settlement: The View From Hanoi, by Richard A. Falk; A Plan to Neutralize Vietnam, by Cyril E. Black, Klaus Knorr, Oran R. Young and Richard A. Falk; Vietnam: Perceptions of Insanity, review essay of three books by Stanley Millet; For a New U.N. Human Rights Agency, by Louis B. Sohn; On Causes and Cures of World Crises, editorial; Needed: A World Currency, by Byron Johnson; Can Propaganda Be Controlled?, a review essay by John B. Whitton; World Law and Justice—When?, a review essay by Urban Whitaker; Who Hankers After Civil Defense?, a review essay by John E. Ullmann.

DECEMBER—The Great Nuclear Debate: Parity vs. Superiority; participants, Jerome B. Wiesner, Adam Yarmolinsky, Donald G. Brennan, Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupe; Where Nixon Stands on Arms Control and Disarmament, text of Nixon policy statement; What Kind of Foreign Policy Under Nixon?, editorial; The Drama of Development, by Lynn Turgeon; World Government: An Outside Route, by Arthur Brackman.

the Humanist

a journal of humanist and ethical concern with a modern viewpoint

Topics treated in recent issues:

- legalized abortion
- conscientious objection
- civil disobedience
- the sexual revolution
- the future of integration
- marijuana and the law
- church/state relations
- issues of world law

Contributors to recent issues:

Leslie Fiedler, B. F. Skinner, Allen Ginsberg, Benjamin Spock, Martin Luther King, James E. Groppi, Charles Frankel, Barbara Ward, Kenneth Boulding, Staughton Lynd, Corliss Lamont, Sidney Hook, Algernon D. Black, Edgar Friedenberg, Dick Gregory, Bertram Wolfe, Willard Wirtz, Harold Taylor, James Farmer, A. A. Berle, Louis Sohn, and many others.

THE HUMANIST is a publication of the American Humanist Association

Please enter my name at once to the growing numbers of *Humanist* subscribers.

TO: THE HUMANIST
Dept. W116
4244 Ridge Lea Road
Amherst, N. Y. 14226

☐ payment enclosed ☐ 1 year ($4.50)
☐ 2 years ($8.00) ☐ please bill me

Name .....
Address .....
City .....
State ..... Zip .....